

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 remain pending in the present application. Claims 1, 3 and 4 have been amended. Basis for the amendments can be found throughout the specification, claims and drawings as originally filed.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1 and 9 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by JP-A-58-33075.

In amended Claim 1 of the present application, there is defined a refrigerant passage portion through which the high-pressure refrigerant from the radiator flows toward the compressor while bypassing the second evaporator when the switching device switches between the first circulation and the second circulation. Therefore, it can prevent the amount of refrigerant flowing from being greatly changed in the vapor-compression refrigerant cycle system during the switching time from the first circulation to the second circulation for example. This limitation added in Claim 1 is described beginning on lines 23 page 17 to line 10 page 18.

JP-A-58-33075 describes a refrigerant cycle system using R134a as refrigerant. Therefore, gas refrigerant is condensed in a condenser (16). That is, the refrigerant cycle system of JP-A-58-33075 is a receiver cycle having a receiver (17). Therefore, the problem is not caused regarding the pressure of the high-pressure side refrigerant from being excessively increased and the refrigerant flow amount from being greatly changed when the switching device switches between the first circulation and the second circulation. In addition, JP-A-58-33075 does not describe anything regarding a

refrigerant passage portion through which high-pressure refrigerant from the radiator flows while bypassing the second evaporator at the switching time between the first circulation and the second circulation.

Thus, Applicants believe Claim 1, as amended, patentably distinguishes over the art of record. Likewise, Claim 9, which depends from Claim 1, is also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 58-33075 in view of Nishida, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,092,379). Claim 2 depends from Claim 1. As stated above, Claim 1 has been amended and is now believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Thus, Claim 2 is also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Claims 3-8 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 3 and 4 each depended from Claim 1. Claims 3 and 4 have each been amended to independent form to include the limitations of Claim 1 and are thus believed to be allowable. Claims 5-8 depend from Claim 4.

Claims 10-16 were indicated as allowable.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 5, 2004

By: 

Michael J. Schmidt, 34,007

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MJS/pmg